1-11-85 से 30-6-88 तक की अवधि दौरान उत्तर प्रदेश के 9 जिलों में अनुसूचित जाति/अनुसूचित जनजाति के 12 व्यक्तियों को खुदरा बिक्री केन्द्रों (पेट्रोल/डीजल) की डीलरशिप दी गई।

(ख) जी, नहीं।

(ग) जी, हां।

उत्तर प्रदेश में बिजली की आवश्यकता

1524. **श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय** : क्या ऊर्जा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) उत्तर प्रदेश में इस समय बिजली की अनुमानित मांग कितनी है और इसके अगले तीन वर्षों के प्राक्कलन क्या हैं ;

(ख) राज्य में बिजली का वर्तमान उत्पादन कितना है और आवश्यकता के मुकाबले में कमी कितनी है; और

(ग) मांग और पूर्ति के अन्तर को समाप्त करने के लिए क्या कदम उठाए जा रहे हैं ?

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय में विद्युत विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री कल्पनाथ राय) : (क) उत्तर प्रदेश में अप्रैल से जुलाई, 1988 की अवधि के दौरान ऊर्जा की मांग 8040 मिलियन यूनिट थी। उत्तर प्रदेश में वर्ष 1989-90, 1990-91 तथा 1991-92 के दौरान ऊर्जा की अनुमानित मांग क्रमश: 25053 मिलियन यूनिट, 27240 मिलियन यूनिट तथा 30053 मिलियन यूनिट होने की आशा है।

(ख) अप्रैल से जुलाई, 1988 की अवधि के दौरान उत्तर प्रदेश में 6991 मिलियन यूनिट ऊर्जा उपलब्ध थी जिसके परिणामस्वरूप 1049 मिलियन यूनिट की कमी रही (लगभग 13%)।

(ग) विद्युत की मांग और सप्लाई के बीच अन्तर को पूरा करने के लिए विभिन्न उपाय किए जा रहे हैं जिनमें ये शामिल हैं—नई क्षमता शीघ्र चालू करना, विद्यमान क्षमता का इष्टतम सदुपयोजन करना, लघु निर्माण अवधि वाली परियोजनाओं को कार्यान्वित करना, पारेषण और वितरण हानियों में कमी करना, ऊर्जा संरक्षण तथा मांग प्रबंध संबंधी उपायों को कार्यान्वित करना और फालतू विद्युत वाले क्षेत्रों से घाटे वाले क्षेत्रों को ऊर्जा की सप्लाई करना।

Calculation of amount over charges by drug; companies

1525. DR. BAPU KALDATE:

DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINT MAHISHI:

SHRI DAYANAND SAHAY:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 281 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 17th August, 1987 and state:

(a) what are "the details of the pleas made by his Ministry for direction of the Supreme Court against the drug companies whose cases were decided;

(b) what are the details of undertakings given by the drug companies in the High Courts;

(c) whether it is a fact that the amount calculated against each Company as being overcharged is in accordance with the undertakings; and

(d) if so, what are the basis of calculation of the amount overcharged by the drug companies?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) and (b) The Division bench of Delhi High Court passed an Order on 25.11.1981 requiring each company to deposit the difference in the prices charged by them and the prices fixed by the Government within 8 weeks in ease of dismissal of their petitions. The orders were passed on the basis of undertaking given by individual petitioner company themselves. The Hon'ble Suupreme Court in its judge-

merit decided in AprilјMay, 1987 that the said undertakings given to Delhi High Court subsists. As these companies did not deposit the amount, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was moved for necessary directions to the companies, for immediate compliance of the undertaking.

(c) and (d) The amount was worked out with reference to the prices charged by the companies and the price fixed by the Government.

Price decontrol on neosporin rang* drugs

1526. SHRI DAYANAND SAHAY: DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI: DR. BAPU KALDATE: t

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased.to state:

(a) what were the basis in which Neosporin, Dilosyn, Banadryl; Hsl-maccel; Zoandin; Evion; Kenacort having monopoy were recommended for price decontrol;

(b) whether his Ministry verified the turn-over and monopoly share before accepting the recommendations of identification; and

(c) if so, how such discrepancies happened and if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (c"> These drugs were recommended by the Kelkar Committee for price decontrol as per its criteria. The exclusion criteria adopted by the Committee are given in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1565 for 8.8.88. These were accepted by the Government. It was an Export Committee which submitted its report after detailed study and con-sulatation with various groups, as-» sociations, interested parties, etc. and it was not found necessary to further examine the issues already examined in detail by the Committee. Representations received about discrepancies and categorisation have been forwarded to the Committee.

Implementation of drugs prices

1527. SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU: DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that certain drug companies filed with petitions against the prices fixed Tor the bulk drugs and formulation under DPCD, 1979;

(b) in how many cases- the courts have given final judgements;

(c) the names of the drug companies names of the bulk drugs, names of the formulations along with pi-ices fixed under DPCO, 1979 which were upheld by different courts;

(d) whether it is a fact that certain drug companies did not implement the prices fixed by Government;

(e) if so, the names of such drug companies along with the names of the products for which prices have not been implemented so far;

(f) what are the reasons for not acting as per the court's judgement and not implementing the prices; ;and

(g) the names of the drug companies whose cases are still pending in courts along with the names of products are the names of courts in which such cases are pending?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (c) and (g) To the extent information is available is given in the enclosed Statement. (See *below)*

(d) to (f) All the concei-ned companies were advised to implement the prices and the State Drugs Controllers were also asked to ensure im-plementation of prices fixed by Government for these companies.